



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,165	06/27/2003	Serge Julien Auguste Imhoff	DN2003076	7815
27280	7590	04/23/2007	EXAMINER	
THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 823			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1144 EAST MARKET STREET			1733	
AKRON, OH 44316-0001			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/609,165	IMHOFF ET AL.	
Examiner Justin R. Fischer	Examiner	Art Unit	
	1733		
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:			
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because			
(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			
(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. 			
6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: _____.			
Claim(s) objected to: _____.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,8,11-13,16 and 17</u>.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>			
8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.			
<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>			
11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.			
12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____			
13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.			
 Justin R Fischer Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1733			

Continuation of 11: As currently drafted, the claims require a first polyepoxide disposed on the surface of the untwisted yarns and a second polyepoxide disposed on the surface of the twisted cord. As detailed in the previous communication, the above noted claim language does not require the respective polyepoxide coatings to be different from one another. **The data submitted by applicant does not provide evidence that a two-step application process results in a materially different article, as compared to a single step application process (Boon), given an equivalent coating thickness.** The data in Table A appears to suggest, assuming the same thickness on the adhesive activated yarns, that the presence of more coating (as a result of a second step) results in an improvement in runflat endurance. These results, though, are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention as the claims are entirely silent as to the thickness or dimension of the respective polyepoxide layers. A more persuasive showing of unexpected results would be a comparison between a first cord formed with a single application process and a second cord formed with a two-step application process, wherein the combined thicknesses of the two-step process are equal to the thickness of the one-step process. In this instance, any realized benefits would be clearly attributable to the two-step process.

Also, it is emphasized that the data submitted by applicant does not suggest that the specific manufacturing method imparts distinctive structural characteristics to the final product (being that the claims contain product-by-process limitations). There is no indication that a detectable interface is present between the first and second

Art Unit: 1733

polyepoxide coatings and thus, it is unclear if the respective methods result in materially different products (given an equivalent coating thickness).



Justin R Fischer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

JRF
April 17, 2007